Executive Statewide Budget Prop

## Date EXECUTIVE PRESENT LAW PROPOSALS

820

Present law is defined in statute as "that level of funding needed under present law operations and services at the level authorized by the previous legislature, including but not limited to:

- o Changes resulting form legally mandated workload, caseload, or enrollment increases or
- Changes in funding requirements resulting form constitutional or statutory schedules or formulas:
- Inflationary or deflationary adjustments; and
- Elimination of nonrecurring appropriations."

As such, it incorporates a number of elements, with changes in caseload, enrollments, and populations; as well as annualizations of previous actions (i.e. the state employee pay plan) the most likely to cause the greatest change.

The executive proposes \$471.0 million in general fund present law adjustments in the 2009 biennium. This is an unusually high amount compared to recent biennia. Two of the out-of-the-ordinary factors that contribute to this large increase are:

- o Increases for K-12 education provided during the December 2005 Special Session
- o Changes in the percentage of Medicaid costs that the federal government will pay.

There are also two primary factors that inflate this total beyond the amount necessary to maintain services at the level established by the last legislature:

- The executive includes at least \$78 million general fund for proposals that should have been classified as new initiatives for legislative prioritization, this issue is discussed in more detail in the "Executive New Initiatives" section that follows, page 151
- LFD analysis concludes that the executive overstates the amount of present law adjustments necessary to maintain services in five areas, as shown in the following table; the table includes both general fund and I-149 (tobacco tax) funds, which have flexibility of use for a number of purposes for legislative prioritization for which general fund is the primary alternative; please note that this table includes only the major overstated present law adjustments

Each of these elements is discussed in more detail in the relevant sections of the agency narratives in Volumes 3, 4, and 6.

LFD **ISSUE**  As a result of both the mischaracterization of certain new proposals and overstatement of executive required, the present law

overstated the amount of funds necessary to maintain government at the level authorized by the last legislature by at least \$100 million.

## Figure 14

Executive Present Law Adjustments in Excess of LFD Estimates General Fund and I-149 Funding, Only 2009 Biennium

	2007 Bielinia	
E tions		Amount
Functions Corrections Po	pulations In	\$20,000,000 600,000
Nursing Home	es	3,000,000 8,400,000
Big Sky Rx**		\$32,000,000

\*LFD estimates of nursing home days is lower than the executive. However, the source of the funding is not clear.

\*\*I-149 (tobacco tax) funds

I

## INFLATION/DEFLATION

Statute requires the governor to submit a present law budget, with "present law" defined as "that additional level of funding needed to maintain operations and services at the level authorized by the previous legislature". The statutory definition includes inflationary and deflationary adjustments. The executive budget does not include a general inflation factor for all operating expenses, but instead applies an inflation or deflation factor to fiscal 2006 expenditures for only 26 specific operating items out of the 531 items contained in the budget request.

Figure 21 shows the executive budget inflation and deflation factors and the items to which they are applied. Of the 26 items, the five deflated items are services purchased from other state agencies, and

payments for these items or services go into a proprietary The account. legislature sets the other that rates state agencies must pay for the items or services, and thus determines the fund levels maintained in proprietary accounts. Of the 21 are items that are 14 inflated, related to food. The largest inflationary increase percentage terms is for "In-state State

Motor Pool"

S,	s, the five deflated items are services particularly figure 21							1		
Inflation and Deflation Factors										
Executive Budget 2009 Brennium										
	Dollar Change Total									al
			Percentage Ch. From Fiscal 200	6 Base	State Ag	encies	Fiscal 2008	Fiscal 2009	Fiscal 2008	Fiscal 2009
		Item Name	Fiscal 2008 Fisc	al 2009	Fiscal 2008	Fiscal 2009	FISCAL 2000			
^	Account	item ivante						\$8,411	\$46,463	\$64,644
Inf	lation			6.40%	\$40,418	\$56,233	\$6,045	567.652	493,492	771,963
	205	Food	4.60% 14.00%	21.90%		204,311	362.883 0	0	4,165	5,795
	225	Books & Reference Material	4.60%	6.40%	4,165	5,795 30,685	ľ	0	22,055	30,685 12,874
	251	Meat	4.60%	6.40%		12,874	0	0	9,253 1,803	2,508
	2252	Dairy	4.60%	6.40%		2,508	0	0	49,696	69,143
	2253	Produce Bakery	4.60%	6.40%	1	69,143	0	0	2,603	3,622
	2254 2264	Grocery	4.60%	6.40% 6.40%	٠	3,622		533	1	9,626
	2275	Poultry	4.60% 4.60%	6.40%	٠	9,094		0		3,101
	2278	Beverages	4.60%	6.409	6 2,229	3,101	1 1	0		
	2279	Red Meat	4.60%	6.409	8.479	11,797	' I 🔒	C		
	2288	Canned Goods	4.60%	6.40		2,77	1 .	(	0.051	
	52289	Staples Sea Foods	4.60%	6.40		4,10		(	1,37	
	52291	Pork	4.60%	6.40	/°I		7   1	89.89	•	534,520
	62292 62298	Fish/Fish Eggs	4.60%	6.40 8.60	<b>"</b>	444.63			· 1	6 889.756
	62304	Postage & Mailing	8.60% 39.03%	41.06		887,66			0 1,114,20	7 1,172,158
	62404	In-state State Motor Pool	39.03%	41.06	1,114.20		00		8 549.32	8 792,301 0 2,557,790
١	62510	Motor Pool Leased Vehicle	5.20%	7.50	272,27		"	1,462.35		1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
	62601	Electricity	31.00%	31.00			34 592,358	926.6	17 638,34 47 \$6,893,44	
- 1	62603	Natural Gas Library Books	14.00%	21.9	0% 45,98 \$4,100,48			\$3,457.14	30,093,	
	63125 Subto		l l		34,100,40	•	1		(0.12.2)	06) (\$42,206
			1		0% (\$42,20	)6) (\$42. <sup>2</sup>	(\$	v,	\$0) (\$42,2) 73) (37,3	02) (37,302
1	Deflatio	Disk Storage Charges DofA	-4.40%				(7	٠,	73) (37.3	85) (8.185
	62142 62172	Batch CPU Seconds DofA	-4.50%		0% (37.22 50% (8.15	35) (8.	185)	0	0 (87.9	741 (87.924
	62177	TSO CPU Seconds DofA	-4.50% -4.50%		50% (87.9)	24) (87.	7247	0 Q	0 (10.7	38) (10./30
	62178	IDMS CPU Seconds DofA	-4.50% -4.50%		50% (10.7		738) 781) (\$		\$73) (\$186.3	(\$186.353
	62180	CICS CPU Seconds DofA	1 7.50%		(\$186,2	81) (\$186.	<b>4</b> 01/1		207	085 \$7.753.28
.	Sub	total	ļ		\$3.914.2	02 \$4,296	209 \$2,792,8			
1	Net Ch	angé	}		33.914,2	.02				pectively

"Motor Pool Leased the Executive Budget noted increases of 19.6 and 14.7 percent for FY 2008 and FY 2009, respectively, for these two items, the actual increases are 39.0 percent and 41.0 percent. The largest inflationary increase in dollar terms is for natural gas, adding \$5.1 million to the total biennial budget.

The total amounts shown for FY 2008 and 2009 (\$6.7 million and \$7.8 million, respectively) represent the total amount the "all funds" base budget was increased due to applying inflation adjustments. These amounts, by fiscal year, are shown in agency budgets as statewide present law adjustments in the present law adjustment table.

and

## **FIXED COSTS**

everal programs within state government provide services to support other functions of state vernment, for which they charge a fee. These types of programs are commonly called internal rvice programs. The legislature does not appropriate funds for the provider programs because they e utilizing internal service funds, which do not require appropriations. Instead, the legislature proves the maximum level of fees the programs may charge to generate revenue to fund operations. In appropriation to pay these fees is then provided to the paying agencies in HB 2. The funding is located to the paying agencies based upon set criteria, anticipated usage, and expenditures of the ternal services programs. This funding is referred to as "fixed costs" and is part of the statewide esent law adjustments in each agency. Nearly \$100 million is assessed to state agencies in the recutive budget to pay these inter-service fees. Controlling the rates charged and the level of ervices provided can significantly impact the rate of growth in state expenditures.

gure 20 details each of the internal service programs and the total fixed costs included in the xecutive budget in support of those functions. The figure also compares total costs in the executive udget in the 2009 biennium with costs budgeted in the 2007 biennium. All internal services programs or which a fixed cost is charged are in the Department of Administration, with the exception of the atewide cost allocation plan and the legislative audit function.

	Figure 20				
	Comparison of Fixed Costs				
	2007 to 2009 Biennium				
	( in Millions)				
		2007 Riennium	2009 Biennium	Difference	Percent
Subcommittee/Agency	Program	Dicinitals	270,233		
General Government Administration	Insurance and Bonds Warrant Writing Fees Payroll Service Fees Data Network Services SABHRS Operating Messenger Services Web Services*	\$28.9 1.6 0.9 21.6 12.7 0.3 0.0	\$25.8 2.0 1.0 27.2 13.4 0.4 0.4	(\$3.1) 0.4 0.1 5.6 0.7 0.1 0.4	-10.7% 25.0% 11.1% 25.9% 5.5% 33.3%
Legislative Audit Division Various Total *Beginning in FY 2009.	Rent - Buildings Grounds Maintenance Audit Fees Statewide Cost Allocation/State Fund Allocation	13.5 0.7 3.1 <u>3.7</u> \$87.0	16.0 1.0 3.3 <u>5.6</u> \$96.1	2.5 0.3 0.2 1.9 \$ <u>9.1</u>	18.59 42.99 6.59 51.49 10.59

As shown, fixed costs increase by \$9.1 million (10.5 percent) in the 2009 biennium over the 2007 biennium appropriations. Funding for fixed costs is provided based upon the funding mix of the agency. Therefore, all funding sources of the agency are used. An estimated \$3.5 million of the costs in the table are funded with general fund.

There are two issues for legislative consideration: 1) the lack of justification for many of the fixed costs; and 2) the method used by the legislature for approving rates may need re-examination.